DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 511 EA 030 726

AUTHOR	Smith, Wade; Ellett, Chad D.
TITLE	Reconceptualizing School Leadership for the 21st Century: Music, Metaphors, and Leadership Density.
PUB DATE	2000-02-00
NOTE	25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, Louisiana, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Effectiveness; Educational Change; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Group Dynamics; Group Structure; Imagery; *Jazz; Leaders; *Leadership Qualities; Metaphors; Organizational Climate; Organizational Communication; *Participative Decision Making; Power Structure; *Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

Efforts to change the role of principals over the past 30 years typically reflect a leader-centrist perspective of schools illustrated by the metaphors of a marching band or the slightly less hierarchical classical orchestra. In these conceptual systems, policy (score) is generated (composed) by policymaking bodies (composers) with principals (conductors) directing teachers (orchestra members) and students (mini-orchestras). Small-combo jazz differs from other musical groups in the degree of creativity encouraged, member rapport, form and structure, audience expectations, constant changes in leadership from player to player, with each member bringing unique knowledge and expertise, and the greater importance of each group member's contributions. Unlike traditional schools, jazz schools are process, not outcome, oriented, and assume teachers and students create their own knowledge in harmony with others. Like small-combo jazz, characteristics of schools with high leadership density include: (1) individual and group/organization efficacy; (2) a strong learning environment; (3) constructivist learning; (4) an exciting social climate; (5) appropriate teacher autonomy; (6) breadth and depth of knowledge; (7) collaboration; (8) collective ownership and (9) dynamic leadership. Traditional schools are driven by external goals and developed with little teacher input, whereas jazz schools embrace learning as an ongoing process, creativity, teachers working in small groups, and internally developed performance standards. Future research using semantic differential methodology will be correlated to other important measures, including self-efficacy beliefs, school culture, organizational effectiveness, receptivity to change, and decision-making. (Contains 46 references.) (TEJ)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 511

Reconceptualizing School Leadership for the 21st Century: Music, Metaphors, and Leadership Density

Wade Smith and Chad D. Ellett

Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. SMITH

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana

February, 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 030 246

Reconceptualizing School Leadership for the 21st Century: Music, Metaphors, and Leadership Density

Conceptions of Leadership and the Principal

The issue about what constitutes an effective principal has been ongoing and is well documented in the professional literature (e.g. Blumberg &Greenfield, 1980; Boyan, 1988; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1979; Effective Instructional Management, 1983; Ellett, 1992; Fullan, 1993; 1997; Hughes, 1999; Murphy, 1991; Murphy and Seashore Louis, 1999; Lambert, 1998; Lane & Walberg, 1987; Sergiovanni, 1987; Seyfarth, 1999; Teddlie, 1994; Zappulla, 1983). However, during the past century, the role of the principal has seen little change (Tyack & Honsot, 1982). This stasis has been maintained even though there have been waves of reform aimed at reshaping the principal's and the teacher's role (Cuban, 1984). Said plainly, rhetoric has been readily adapted to meet public expectation while actual practice remained relatively unchanged. However, during the past thirty or so years, there has been a concerted effort to change the role of the principal. It would not be an exaggeration to say more change has occurred to the role of the principal within this time than the entire previous century. These changes have generally followed the progress of and mirrored leadership studies conducted in the fields of psychology and business (e.g. Steers, Porter, &Bigley, 1996; Yukl, 1998; Bryman, 1996; Bass & Avolio, 1990, 1993; Fiedler, 1967, 1993; House, 1971).

In broad terms, the last three decades have seen the principal's primary role shift from: a) manager, to b) instructional leader, and finally to c) transformational/transactional leader or *new leadership*. Each of these roles have found the principal in some form of a leader centrist role. For example, when principals were viewed as program managers their main task was to oversee teaching

subordinates (Cuban, 1988; Tycak, 1974). Instructional leadership framed principals as instructional foremen of sorts, overseeing, trouble shooting, and helping to repair any malfunctions in the implementation of externally created mandates handed down to the local educational assembly line. Even calls for new leadership such as transformational or transactional leadership seem to emanate from a highly centrist perspective, even though transformational leaders are viewed as leaders of meaning rather than their influence over others (Bryman, 1996).

In more specifically generalizing these *new leadership* notions to school principals, Hoy and Miskel (1996) state that the transformational leader: 1) recognizes the need for change; 2) creates new visions and commitments to visions; 3) concentrates on long-term goals; and 4) inspires others to transcend their interests for organizational goals. There is an obvious move away from the simple listing of attributes seen in previous studies of leadership towards language that better captures the complexities of leadership. However, close examination reveals that these *transformational attributes* are further examples of a leader centrist paradigm, closely linked in concept to earlier leadership models seeking a *great leader*. In this conception of leadership, change and direction still emanates from a central source (the principal) rather than the organization as a whole, or sub elements within the larger organization. Consider the following attributes of transformational leaders detailed by Hoy and Miskel with accompanying analyses of their leader centrist tendencies:

> 1) *recognize the need for change*—Change happens whether we recognize the need for it or not...it is inevitable (Fullan, 1993). To "recognize the need for change" strongly implies that the direction of change should also be recognized by the transformational leader. This implication is borne out by the next point.
>
> 2) *creating new visions and commitments to visions*—Here is a clear reference to the *great leader* that has been so prevalent in earlier works. It is from this reference point that

the context of the next point must be considered.

3) *concentration on long-term goals*—This statement should be viewed from the perspective that the visions created by the *great leader* in point 2 should become institutionalized as goals. Additionally, the whole notion of concentrating on long-term goals illustrates a linear, means/ends model where projects can begin and outcomes can be predicted with a high degree of certainty. Clear vestiges of the factory model of schooling are seen in this element of leadership, a model that transformational leadership purportedly disavows.

4) *inspires others to try and transcend their interests for organizational goals—The* fourth tenet is predicated by the philosophical underpinnings of the previous three. The leader has decided change is needed, created a vision of how to bring about change, and created long-term goals so all will know if they are changing correctly. Given all this, it stands to reason the leader's final obligation will be to convince others that they should accept this whole process and actively embrace it.

Thus, the transformational leader appears as one who attempts to influence others through either transmitting a vision to subordinates in the organization, or who molds organizational members to fit the vision. The direction of influence for organizational change and leader centrist notions still seems quite apparent in this current, popular conception of school leadership.

Summary

Newer conceptualizations of the leadership role of the principal have attempted to bring a new focus on leadership and its effects into the schools. Over time, there has been a marked effort to move away from *the great person* theory of leadership towards a collegial and collaborative exchange between those within a professional learning organization (Senge, 1990). A growing awareness of the complexities involved in the principalship can be seen as one moves from *the principal as manager* towards *the principal as transformational leader.* However, one thing remains consistent throughout the evolutive stages of the principalship: The principal is still *the leader*, even though literature on *new leadership* disavows this conclusion.

This leader centrist notion may not be the best way to actively involve teachers and students with the change process. And, if Fullan (1999) is correct, the future success of schools will not rest upon the faithful duplication of a successful program but rather the *replication of the environment which produced the success.* This is not as simple as it sounds, since many factors within the environment are highly contingent upon one another in often subtle and sublime ways, underscoring the necessity for teachers and principals to be able to successfully manage a complex change process. Anecdotal evidence (e.g. the rather dismal results of attempting to infuse the correlates of effective schools into schools as a simple menu-driven recipe for improvement) is ample and strongly refutes the simplistic notion that importing a program from one site to another is a recipe for success. It is not enough to copy a program which has enjoyed success elsewhere. This is merely one more example of teachers being told what to do and how to do it. Nor will it be sufficient to try and replicate the external factors making up an environment (e.g. high morale, low student/teacher ratios, What is needed is an environment that allows for and fosters healthy exchanges where everyone's talents and leadership abilities can be used.

The Role of Metaphors in Leadership

Lakoff and Johnson (1981) make a compelling argument that most of our conceptual system is metaphorical. If this is true, and their argument is persuasive, then how we think, perceive things, and ultimately act is a function of our metaphorical models of reality. Consider how Lakoff and Johnson use the metaphor *argument is war* to illustrate their position. Our everyday language reinforces the *argument is war* metaphor: "He demolished my argument." "You'll get wiped out if you use that argument." "All of my arguments were shot down." "I'm going in for the kill." Our whole legal system is based upon *argument is war.* Lawyers first plan

strategy before engaging the opponent. Once the trial is begun, one side defends its position while attacking the others. Experts are used as reinforcements, brought in to bolster a position. It is easy to see how ingrained our metaphorical systems become. Although *argument is peace* is just as logically compelling as *argument is war*, it holds no value in our society. *From this we can tell that if we want to change the way a system such as a school operates it will first be necessary to change the metaphors it operates by.*

There are several metaphors at work now that constrain our current notion of what leadership is and how it operates. The factory, with its attempt to faithfully reproduce a product time after time comes to mind along with Tyack's One Best System. Classical music also provides a powerful metaphorical basis from which current leadership conceptualizations emanate. Although most people probably would not think of classical music as a metaphor for leadership, there are striking congruencies. In classical music, the orchestra's goal is faithful reproduction of music written by a composer. Normally, the composer has no contact or dialogue with the orchestra members ultimately responsible for the score's faithful replication. The conductor functions as the leader, responsible for any interpretations and nuances brought to the music. Musicians are expected to abide by the conductor's choices . . .a little softer here . . . perhaps a little more legato . . .attack that measure.

The parallels with current leadership assumptions are striking. In the particular case of education, policy (score) is generated (composed) by legislative or policy bodies (the composer). This policy eventually makes its way to the school level, where principals (conductors) are expected to take the policy and get the teachers (orchestra members) to play it as faithfully as possible. Once the teachers receive their scores the information is passed on to the students who

are expected to perform as "mini-orchestras," playing their parts with a careful diligence towards remaining true to what the teacher/conductor mandates is important.

It should not be overlooked that no living organization could survive for long with such a restrictive information exchange as the factory or classical music metaphors describe. Living systems often require instant capacity to deal with disequilibrium and the path utilized by the organism to deal with disequilibrium can vary extensively depending upon circumstances also. Biologically speaking, *there is no one best system!* Is it possible that social, educational, and business systems need the same flexibility as living systems? If so, we must look beyond the limiting metaphors presently in use to conceptualize leadership in a different light. It seems, given the unoriginal rhetoric that accompanies most of the literature on *new leadership*, a renewed effort is needed to break out of old models and to actively rethink what leadership is. However, what has not happened yet is a break with old metaphors. Until this happens, it will be difficult if not impossible to change conceptualizations about what leadership is.

A New Metaphor for Leadership

What choice is there besides the factory/classical music metaphor currently driving thinking on leadership? The new metaphor *is* musical, but it not the classical music metaphor that pervades current conceptions of leadership. Jazz, specifically small combo jazz, seems appropriate for a new metaphor of leadership (Smith & Ellett, 1999). Our perspective goes beyond the rhetoric of the *new leadership* and creates a metaphorical context that allows for a clear understanding of how **leadership density** (Ellett, 1996, Sergiovanni, 1987, Smith & Ellett, 2000) can be created and how leadership density maps onto the small combo jazz metaphor for leadership in schools.

Leadership density is an organizational construct. There is no attempt to build a framework detailing characteristics or traits of the leader as in previous studies (e.g. House &

Podsakoff, 1994; Kenny & Zaccaro, 1983; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Instead of looking for a leader and hoping to find leadership, we advance a notion of leadership that says it is any action which requires a response by one or more members of an organization. Density is borrowed from physics as a means to depict the amount of leadership decisions taking place. One might conclude that all schools have leadership density from this definition and to a degree they would be correct. However, in a centrist school when the impact of decisions is taken into account most of the important decisions are made by *the leader*. Schools with numerous oversight committees may have some degree of shared decision making and therefore a broadened base of leadership, but this is not sufficient to encompass our view of what effective leadership density is. We argue that highly centrist notions of leadership are metaphorically analogous to a marching band in that they share common attributes of being highly structured, hierarchical, and lock-step in their implementation. Slightly less centrist leadership corresponds metaphorically to a symphonic orchestra where the individual members' expertise receives higher recognition but the collective effort is still constrained by a predetermined score and a conductor that insures it is played one certain way. Momentarily we will show why these metaphors for leadership best capture current implementations of leadership and why they acts as constraints upon the creativity, flexibility, and productivity of schools.

School Leadership as Small Combo Jazz

Jazz as a metaphor for depicting leadership in business organizations has been previously explored by DePree (1992). However, his use of the jazz metaphor is highly centrist and directly reminiscent of orchestra and band metaphors described by Hurley (1999) and Iwanicki (1999) as applied to leadership in schools. The small jazz combo metaphor for understanding leadership in schools has been previously explicated and compared to traditional leader centrist views in Smith

and Ellett (1999, 2000) and will only be summarized here. Small combo jazz groups and their music can be compared to large orchestras or bands and their music in a variety of ways. For example, they differ in group size, the degree of creativity allowed/encouraged, rapport and exchange among members, variations in interpretations of the score or tune to be played, combinations of instruments, degrees of freedom of expression, form and structure of the music, the goals of performances, the audience and its expectations, etc., Most of all, orchestra and band music differs from small combo jazz in the form of leadership required to make each musical group effective. Thus, leadership is the concern here, particularly as it reflects characteristics of the small jazz combo.

The small combo jazz metaphor of school leadership invokes a variety of ideas about the nature of non-centrist leadership characteristics of schools. For example, small jazz combos have no de-facto leader. Someone may count down and start the group on its way, but once started, each member of the group plays their own interpretation of sweet music using a common melody as a guiding parameter. There is always room for experimenting with ideas in musical structure, innovations in phrasing, ways to compliment the contributions of other musicians, and room to stretch and improve the performance of the group. Unlike a symphony orchestra with its conductor/leader, small combo jazz bands are constantly changing leaders from player to player depending on where the music is at (apologies to Miles Davis). The small combo jazz group is held together by *leadership, not a single leader*.

There are a variety of other characteristics of effective and appreciated small jazz combos that can be differentiated from orchestras and large bands (even large jazz bands). These characteristics also have parallels in thinking about new models (metaphors) for leadership in schools. For example, each member of a small jazz combo brings unique knowledge and expertise

important to the success of the total jazz performance. Because the number of musicians is small, if any musician fails to adequately do his/per part, the performance of the entire group and the quality of the music is visibly and audibly impacted. In a large orchestra, some weak members may be included and/or tolerated, and their performances may be masked by the superior performances of other members, with no visible or audible effects. By analogy, the same situation might well occur in leader centrist schools in which the principal conducts the entire orchestra with the goal of collective excellence. Such schools, and musical metaphors that depict the *school principal as orchestra conductor or band leader*, may well overlook the needs, interests and potential contributions of individual learners (either students or teachers)...factors more readily observed in small groups. Thus, the small combo jazz metaphor suggests the importance of each group member's contributions and collaborative leadership without the necessity of a single group leader always charged with the responsibility to conduct and direct the music.

Those working in a small combo jazz environment are less likely to view mandates and directives generated outside of the school as the ends by which their work should be measured. The monolithic mind set documented in Tyack's *One Best System* (1974) is *not* present nor is it sought by those in the small combo jazz environment. Unlike traditional schools where curriculum is guided primarily through state curriculum guides and school effectiveness is measured and assessed by the results of standardized tests, jazz schools are much more process oriented, viewing learning as an ongoing, dynamic phenomenon rather than an outcome (test score). Performance-based activities such as mastery demonstrations and group projects pervade the curriculum and classes. Teachers recognize that their collective expertise exceeds their individual abilities, thus there is much less emphasis on departmentalization and a heightened emphasis upon using the collective talents of teachers in the most effective manner possible. For

example, teachers may rotate their teaching assignments thereby utilizing their collective talents or decide to team teach if conditions warrant. In the small jazz combo school, it is important to note these decisions are not made externally by the principal as leader of the orchestra or band, nor are they assigned prior to an understanding of classroom context. In the small jazz combo these types of leadership decisions would be made by the *musicians/teachers* and would be subject to their constant review and revision.

The small combo jazz metaphor for understanding leadership and learning in schools seems quite timely in view of contemporary perspectives of constructivist learning (e.g. Brooks & Brooks, 1993), which view each learner's knowledge as individually constructed and suggest that not all students (or teachers) have the same prior knowledge. Also, all students (or teachers) do not construct their understandings and learn and perform in the same way relative to the school's standard curriculum. Similarly, not all musicians in a small jazz combo understand, interpret and play a standard tune in the same way. Small jazz combo music is at its best when there are noticeable variations on a theme (i.e., tune). Schools may be at their best as well, when students and teachers are *not conducted* in their learning, *but are instead, encouraged to construct their own knowledge and skills in harmony with others*. Thus, from the small jazz combo perspective, students and teachers create their own knowledge, not simply receive and copy the knowledge of others.

We believe that schools displaying small combo jazz leadership are implementing leadership consistent with the concept of **leadership density** (Ellett, 1996; Sergiovanni, 1987; Smith & Ellett, 2000). The concept of leadership density implies that school leadership can be best understood from an organizational perspective rather than from the traditional leader centrist perspective traditionally derived from concern for positional authority. A similar call has recently

been made to conceptualize and measure supervision in schools from an organizational climate perspective (Claudet & Ellett, 1999). Schools rich in leadership density are guided by a central theme or melody, as are small combo jazz groups. A quality teaching and learning environment is the constant and enduring melody of a school rich in leadership density. Teachers and administrators within the school acquire leadership based upon individual and group needs, expertise, and professional and moral commitment. Schools with strong leadership density have parallels with the characteristics of small combo jazz groups such as:

1. a strong sense of individual and group/organizational efficacy (all members believe they can play good notes and that the group can make good music as well)

2. a school culture that reflects the primacy of maintaining a strong teaching and learning environment (though one might depart occasionally from the melody through improvisation, the melody should always be recognizable)

3. a curriculum heavily grounded in constructivist learning for both students and teachers (each jazz combo member puts his/her own signature on the music played)

4. an exciting and robust social environment and climate (combo jazz players are enthusiastic, engaged and highly involved in the dramatic content of the music)

5. a level of teacher autonomy that allows for creativity but not at the expense of accomplishing group goals (no small jazz combo player can play as he/she pleases without regard for the melody and the group's total performance)

6. adequate breadth and depth of professional and pedagogical content knowledge (small jazz combo musicians can not simply stand up and honk notes without a broader understanding of the music)

7. cooperativeness and collaboration among group members (listening and musically responding to others in the jazz combo plays an important part in the overall quality of the music produced)

8. a sense of collective ownership and contributions (each player in the small jazz combo recognizes that the whole of the music is greater than the sum of individual contributions to the music)

9. a sense of leadership that is constantly evolving, acquired, dynamic and not ruled by committee (in a small jazz combo the pianist may shorten a solo because the

guitarist is having an exceptionally hot night...and the next night the guitarist might do the same for the saxophone player)

So how might a school rich in leadership density differ from a typical school? The model that follows provides but a few example comparisons.

Trait	Typical School	School Exhibiting Leadership Density	Jazz Combo Analogy
style of leadership	hierarchical, emphasis upon routine, leadership is possessed by predetermined individuals	dynamic leadership, acquired according to circumstances, needs, and abilities of those in the organization	similar to the way jazz players trade riffs and solos
faculty design	departmental	small teams	teams are analogous to jazz combos
teacher autonomy	high . . . teachers work basically as isolated units	low . . . emphasis is upon collaboration and shared creativity	each member of the team needs the other members to make the music complete
efficacy	derived from individual's personal feelings about their ability to make a difference	the individual's feelings of efficacy would be nested within the team's efficacy	band members view their ability to play "sweet music" collectively
curriculum emphasis	minimum competency...effectiveness of teaching to be judged by standardized tests and school means it is assumed that there is one best "melody" that all students should be able to play	quality of teaching/learning environment . . .to be judged by the members of the team and by trained observers, using standards that measure the amount of teaching and learning taking place . . .standardized tests are used as diagnostic aides to determine student strengths and weaknesses No two teams are expected to produce the exact same results	the melody varies for each tune... but the object is always to play the melody as well as possible, always striving for creativity and expression
culture	dependent upon outside sources for guidance and direction (similar to classical orchestra needing an arrangement)	creative, self-reflective, based upon internal expertise and judgement . . .school has a single melody but each team within the school interprets it differently, creating a robust environment	combos use melody to guide the extemporaneous creation of music

The comparisons made above suggest several potential differences between typical (leader centrist) schools and schools characterized by leadership density as described here. For example, these comparisons are reminiscent in part of Glickman's (1987) admonition to first develop *good* schools *before* focusing concern on developing *effective* schools. The above comparisons suggest

that older models of leadership (the centrist view) can be exchanged for newer conceptions of leadership that are collective and acquired by different people at different times, based on need, expertise, and moral commitment. Additionally, the comparisons imply that the traditional roles of administrators and teachers as leaders, and students as learners as well, would be rethought. Teachers' roles in schools, for example, would not by so strongly influenced by a school culture reflecting strong teacher autonomy norms; but rather cultural norms reflecting the value of teachers working together in small teams (participating in their own small jazz combs and making their own contributions to the school's sweet music). Administrators, rather than carrying out traditional leader centrist roles would become part of many small jazz combos in which the leadership contributions of each player are recognized, professionally respected and appreciated (rather than overtly rewarded) and embedded in the larger school culture.

The parallels listed in the above chart between schools dense in leadership and small combo jazz are but a few examples in which the concept of leadership density in schools seems consistent with the small combo jazz metaphor proposed. These parallels bring to the fore the difference between schools rich in leadership density and more traditional conceptions of schools and school leadership. The traditional school is driven by external goals, developed off-site with little or no input from teachers (the orchestra members) and the principal (the maestro). The traditional school operates within a highly constrained input/output system. What the children should know at the end of the year has already been determined and success in attaining goals is measured by standardized tests. Students are expected to operate in a traditional school as third and fourth chair orchestra members, faithfully duplicating the expected score from curriculum guides, worksheets, and chapter reviews while the teacher *conducts* the classroom enterprise (perhaps the string or brass instruments) and *the principal conducts the entire symphony*.

As previously noted, a small combo jazz school would be characterized by a curriculum

that views learning as an ongoing process (not an outcome), and one that embraces constructivism, mastery demonstrations similar to jazz recitals, creative contributions, individual learning portfolios, projects, and the like. Standards would not be imposed by outside sources in the same way that the conductor controls the orchestra's performance. Rather, standards would be part and parcel of the educational process, inseparable from the efforts to meet them. Standardized tests in this kind of educational environment would serve as diagnostic tools to see how the music may be improved, rather than obstacles to overcome before promotion or graduation occur.

In schools characterized by leadership density, teachers would be working in small groups, each group using the quality teaching and learning environment as a parameter (core melody) for their improvisations and experimentations. Large schools would have many jazz combos playing simultaneously, creating a rich and robust atmosphere for learning. In addition, and much like a manager works with a jazz band, the principal could help teachers keep up with educational needs (audience demands) and trends (popular tunes and new styles of music).

Small groups create expectations for teachers that go far beyond the traditional atmosphere in schools where teachers close their door and do their own thing with little external input. Iwanicki's (1999) call for principals to *conduct their symphony* overlooks the fact that principals *never have all of their musicians play before them at the same time.* For example, if a school has 50 teachers and the principal observes two teachers per day for the entire school year (highly unlikely), then 48 teachers are "conductorless" every day. Any staff looking to the principal as the conductor of their music will be woefully lacking for guidance. On the other hand, if teachers see themselves as responsible for creating sweet music (a quality teaching and learning environment) then the standards for excellence become internalized and part of the school's culture. Rather than creating a school without standards, a small combo jazz

environment requires teachers to look beyond themselves as individuals and to work creatively, but in concert with their colleagues, thereby facilitating a collaborative and professional organization. Standards emerge from creative practice, continuous learning, and appreciation of individual differences, not from externally imposed values of what schools should accomplish or ought to be or through punitive work inspection by the principal. As Fullan (1993) has reminded us, the quality of schooling and performance standards are culturally imbedded in most schools. Thus, politicians and others can not "mandate what matters." Goals and performance standards in a small jazz combo are both collective and individual, created internally, and emanate from the cultural norms reflected in the among the musicians and inherent in the music.

Clearly, to perform well an orchestra requires a conductor on an ongoing basis. The nature of the orchestra's task (correctly playing a predetermined score) and the large size of the organization suggest that a leader centrist perspective is appropriate. But, does a leader centrist perspective best serve schools, where broad consensus suggest that individual learning is facilitated by small group size (e.g. Finn & Achilles, 1999)? Extending the question of the appropriateness of a leader centrist perspective to the faculty/administrator level, it is appropriate to ask whether the fluid, dynamic instructional decisions that teachers constantly make are best facilitated by a leadership perspective that depends upon a conductor? Conducting requires certainty within the process of producing an expected outcome. It is impossible to produce a *score/lesson* for learning that a teacher can readily conduct because the learning process never contains the certitude of a classical score. The best laid plans of mice and men (hats off to Ben Franklin...or was that John Steinbeck?) are subject to constant revision as are nearly all decisions that are made during the educational process.

Admittedly, strong, centrist leadership may be needed when large group activities are undertaken, a standard procedure or routine needs to be implemented, or when there is a crisis

(e.g., as in war). However, in the everyday life of most schools, none of these scenarios are common, and therefore centrist forms of leadership may not be needed or may not be appropriate to accomplish the ends of schooling. Centrist leadership *can* be useful in schools when administrators make decisions which lessen the procedural burdens of teachers and increase time allocations for teaching and learning. A principal correctly managing the paperwork and non-instructional burdens for teachers to free up time for teaching and learning may very well operate from a strongly centrist perspective in these matters. However, we argue *these matters are different and far removed from the teaching and learning process...which requires leadership density...a different form of leadership in schools than that which currently exists. Leadership density in schools suggests more than conducting the orchestra.* As previously noted, (Immegart, 1988), the extant literature does not differentiate between *leadership processes* in schools and characteristics and responsibilities of a school *leader*. We argue for a new metaphor for leadership in schools (the small jazz combo). We believe this conception can enhance the quality of teaching and learning in schools of the future. We believe that this metaphor and the attendant model of leadership density can contribute much to future research on leadership and theory building as well. To this end, we have recently begun the development of a new measure of leadership density grounded in the small jazz combo metaphor (Smith & Ellett, 1999).

Initial and Future Research

If the small combo jazz metaphor for leadership in schools is a viable conception, research studies will need to be completed to provide empirical support for this new, non-centrist perspective on leadership. To this end, we have recently began the development of a measure of the meaning of the small jazz combo metaphor using semantic differential methodology (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957).

We generated an initial set of 30 semantic differential items (adjectives considered polar opposites in meaning appropriate for measuring meaning in a musical context). The semantic differential musical styles (using the traditional seven point scale) was applied to four different musical genres: marching band (i.e., Sousa), orchestra/classical, big band jazz, and small combo jazz. This measure was then administered to 225 participants. Forty-seven were middle or high school band directors in Louisiana and the other 178 surveyed were students in the school of music at Louisiana State University. Nineteen band directors responded (40% return rate). A 100% return rate was obtained form music students at LSU due to the surveys being filled out during regularly scheduled classes. Four of the student surveys were discarded due to improper responses. All told, 193 surveys (86%) were used to obtain means and standard deviations for each item semantic differential adjective pair. Of particular interest in these results were adjective pairs that most differentiated the musical genres, notably the magnitude of the differences between the extremes of marching band and small combo jazz. The following table provides descriptive statistics for each of the four musical genres.

Descriptors	ala SOUSA		Orchestral		Big Band jazz		Small combo	
	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M
Exciting/dull	1.74	2.27	1.65	2.49	1.02	1.89	1.67	2.79
Unpredictable/predictable	1.94	4.98	1.89	3.95	1.52	3.34	1.45	2.39
Original/ Copied	1.92	4.36	1.79	3.17	1.39	2.79	1.37	2.22
Loose/Tight	1.87	5.19	1.68	4.76	1.54	2.97	1.61	2.55
Divergent/ Convergent	1.69	4.69	1.72	4.13	1.21	3.46	1.37	2.71
Progressive/ Traditional	1.96	4.84	2.00	4.30	1.62	3.46	1.48	2.70
Freedom/ Control	1.91	5.03	1.86	4.45	1.52	2.75	1.33	2.05
Structured/ Unstructured	1.61	2.20	1.67	2.63	1.64	3.68	1.82	4.32
Interpretational/ Recitational	2.04	4.60	1.99	3.71	1.37	2.62	1.30	2.26
Independent/ Dependent	1.99	4.90	1.87	4.38	1.47	2.99	1.55	2.56
Creative/ Imiatative	2.12	4.30	1.91	3.50	1.41	2.41	1.29	2.01
Elastic/ Inflexible	1.96	4.70	1.62	3.93	1.34	2.63	1.29	2.17
Intrinsic/ Extrinsic	1.62	4.27	1.45	3.90	1.26	3.46	1.52	3.02
Open/ Closed	1.97	4.38	1.73	2.91	1.30	2.68	1.33	2.36
Imaginatitve/ Unimaginative	1.91	3.65	1.58	3.02	1.16	2.29	1.07	2.07
Wide/ Narrow	1.94	3.97	1.67	3.37	1.28	2.68	1.44	2.56
Free/ Restrained	1.97	4.40	1.64	3.81	1.23	2.42	1.20	2.06
Informal/ Formal	1.93	4.81	1.61	3.60	1.53	2.78	1.35	2.30
Improvisational/ Rigid	2.08	4.90	1.52	5.28	1.40	2.40	1.27	1.78
Relative/ Absolute	1.78	4.94	1.61	4.51	1.27	3.07	1.31	2.69
Optional/ Mandatory	1.76	4.72	1.62	4.84	1.36	3.25	1.40	2.84
Conceptual/ Factual	1.87	4.72	1.75	4.39	1.26	2.97	1.37	2.68
Short/ Long	1.72	4.18	1.54	5.23	1.39	3.96	1.58	3.80
Fixed/ Variable	1.98	3.41	1.70	3.69	1.51	4.70	1.65	4.86
Soft/ Loud	1.35	5.60	1.21	3.99	1.44	5.18	2.99	4.36
Interpreted/ Scripted	1.83	5.18	1.81	3.92	1.57	3.23	1.33	2.56
Thrilling/ Quieting	1.62	2.54	1.67	3.53	1.24	2.47	1.54	3.15
Weak/ Strong	1.44	5.92	1.44	5.01	1.27	5.65	1.60	4.53
Fluid/ Solid	1.74	5.55	1.74	4.15	1.79	4.21	1.64	3.39

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In viewing the results in the table, there are a couple of interesting patterns reflecting differences in musicians' semantic perspectives of he four musical genres. First, almost without exception, the mean scores change in magnitude from marching band (left column) to small jazz combo (right hand column). Additionally, there are rather large differences when comparing means for Sousa and small jazz combo. Eighteen of the thirty adjective pairs demonstrated mean differences greater than 2.0 in the direction we expected given the nature of the adjective pairs and our predictions when applied to the four musical genres and the meaning of smll jazz combo to us (e.g., Freedom = 5.03 vs Control = 2.05, Interpreted = 5.18 vs Scripted =2.56, Relative = 4.94 vs Absolute = 2.69). Additionally, there were ten of the eighteen adjective pairs that rather strongly differentiated between big band and small combo jazz (e.g., Unpredictable = 3.34 vs Predictable = 2.39, Interpreted = 3.23 vs Scripted = 2.56, Fluid = 4.21 vs Solid = 3.39).

Also of interest were adjective pairs that did not differentiate between the four genres. For example, Exciting/Dull showed no clear patterning of means. This finding can probably be explained owing to the particular group of respondents (all musicians). A random sample of respondents that included non-musicians might well respond quite differently. This logic would probably hold as well for Blended/Heterogeneous and Thrilling/Quieting.

Our research strategy now, is to refine the semantic differential items through additional studies of the small jazz combo metaphor, including establishing the reliability of the semantic differential scale (internal consistency and stability). Included in this work will be administering the scales for the two genres of big band and small combo jazz to a more heterogeneous sample of respondents. Hopefully this will provide strong support for the adjective pairs that most differentiate big band from small combo jazz (two similar adjective pairs, but conceptually different when applied to our new ideas about leadership in schools).

A large-scale study is also in the planning stage to develop a new measure of leadership density that reflects our understanding of the small jazz combo metaphor. Once developed, this measure will be correlated in an extended line of inquiry, with a variety of other important measures (e.g., teacher and administrator self-efficacy beliefs, dimensions of school culture, school organizational effectiveness, receptivity/resistance to change, decision making deprivation). Importantly, we believe the semantic differential items that most differentiate the small jazz combo genre from other genres, will positively correlate with the new leadership density measure. If this eventuates, we will have evidence of the metaphorical basis of a new conception of leadership in schools....leadership density.

REFERENCES

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4, 231-272

Blumberg, A., and Greenfield, W., (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Boyan, N. J. (Ed.) (1988). Handbook of research in educational administration. New York: Longman.

Brookover, W.B. & Lezotte, L.W. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident in changes in student achievement. East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University

Brooks, G.B., and Brooks, M. G., (1993). The case for constructivist classrooms. ASCD: Alexandria, VA.

Bryman, A. (1996). Leadership in organizations. In S.R. Clegg & C. Gardy (Eds.), Handbook or organizational studies. 276-292. London: Sage.

Claudet, J.G. & Ellett, C. D. (1999). Conceptualizing and measuring supervision as an organizational construct. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 14(4), 318-350.

Cuban, L., (1988). The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools. New York: State University Press.

Cuban, L. (1984). How teachers taught. Longman Press: New York.

DePree, Max, D., (1992). Leadership jazz. New York: Dell Publishing.

Edmonds, R. K. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37 (10), 15-24.

Effective Instructional Management. (1983). Arlington, VA: Association for Curriculum Development.

Ellett, C.D., (1996). Leadership density, measurement, and decision making: Mapping the landscape. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York, New York.

Ellett, C.D., (1992). Principal evaluation and assessment. In Marvin Alkins (Ed.) Encyclopedia of educational research. (6th ed.). pp. 1026–1031. Los Angeles: McMillan Publishing Company for American Educational Research Association.

Fiedler, F.E. (1993). The leadership situation and the black box in contingency theories. In M. Chemers and R. Ayman (Eds). Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions. New York: Academic Press.

Fiedler, F.E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Finn, J.D. & Achilles, C. M., (Summer, 1999). Tennessee's class size study: Findings, implications, misconceptions. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 21, (2). 97–109.

Fullan, M., (1999). Change forces: The sequel. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M., (1997). What's worth fighting for in the principalship? New York: Teacher's College Press.

Fullan, M., (1993). Change forces: probing the depths of educational reform. Bristol: PA. Falmer Press.

Glickman, C.D. (1987). Good and/or effective schools: What do we want? Phi Delta Kappan, 68 (8), 622-624.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G., (1996). Educational administration: theory, research, and practice. (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

House, R.J. & Podsakoff, P. M. (1994), Leadership effectiveness: Past perspectives and future directions for research. In J. Greenberg (Ed.) Organizational behavior: The state of the science. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hughes, L. W., (Ed.) (1999). The principal as leader. (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hurley, C. (1999). A response to Bryan Brent. Newsletter of the Teaching in Educational Administration Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Asosciation,6(1), 4-5.

Immegart, G. L. (1988). Leadership and leader behavior. In N. Boyan (ed.). Handbook of research on educational administration. 259-277. New York: Longman Inc. for the American Educational Research Administration.

Iwanicki, E. (1999). ISSLC standards and assessment in the context of school leadership reform. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education. 13 (3), (In Press).

Kenny, D. A. & Zaccaro, S.J. (1983). An estimate of variance due to traits in leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology. 68, 678 – 685.

Kirkpatrick, S.A. & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? Academy of Management Executive, 5, 48 – 60.

Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M., (1981). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lambert, L., (1998). Building leadership capacity in schools. Alexandria, VA: Association for Curriculum Development.

Lane, J. J., & Walberg, H. J., (1987). Effective school leadership: Policy and process. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Murphy, Joseph., (1991). Restructuring schools: capturing and assessing the phenomena. New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J., and Louis, K.S., (1999). Handbook of research on educational administration. (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., & Tannenbaum, P.H. (1957). The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. .

Senge, P.M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of a learning organization. New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T.G. (1987). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Seyfarth, J. T., (1999). The principal. New leadership for new challenges. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Smith, W. & Ellett, C.D., (1999). Sweet music for the new millennium: Jazz as metaphor for 21st century school leadership. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, San Antonio, Texas.

Smith, W. & Ellett, C.D. (April, 2000). Timely discussions, but wrong metaphor for school leadership: A response to Brent and Hurley. Newsletter of the Teaching in Educational Administration Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association, 7 (1), (1–9).

Steers, R. M., Porter, L. W., & Bigley, G. A. (1996) Motivation and leadership at work. (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Teddlie, C., (1994). Context in school effects research. In Reynolds, et al., Advances in school effectiveness research and practice. Tarrytown, New York: Pergamon.

Tyack, D., (1974). The one best system: A history of American urban education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D. and Honsot, E., (1982). Managers of virtue. Basic Books: New York..

Yukl, G. (1998). Leadership in organizations. (4th ed). Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Zappulla, E., (1983). Evaluating administrative performance: Cultural trends and techniques. Belmont, CA: Star Publishing Company.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Reconceptualizing School Leadership for the 21st Century: Music, Metaphors, and Leadership Density

Author(s): WADE SMITH AND CHAD ELLETT

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: 2001, April

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Wade Smith	Printed Name/Position/Title: WADE SMITH ASST. PROF.
Organization/Address: AUBURN UNIVERSITY	Telephone: (334) 8443067 FAX: (334) 8443072
	E-Mail Address: smithwo@auburn.edu Date: 8/29/02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:	ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management ~~1787 Agate Street~~ 5207 University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97403-5207 Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)